Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/719,321	HIROTSU, DENNIS OSAMU		
Examiner	Art Unit		
PAULA L. CRAIG	3761		

	PAULA L. CRAIG	3761			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 January 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:					
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 07 January 2008. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) \(\sum \text{ will not be entered, or b)} \(\subseteq will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-3 and 5-7.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a		
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:		
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)				
/Tatyana Zalukaeva/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3761					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the visual display feature of Kuske is intended to frame a graphic on the absorbent article, and is typically oriented on the end panel of the bag. Applicant argues that even if the teachings of Kuske and Lash were combined, only one type of absorbent article would be visible through the end panel of Kuske. Kuske teaches four windows 88, 96, 98, and 106, and teaches that these windows may be continuous with each other (Figs. 3 and 5-12, col. 5, line 21 to col. 7, line 67). Kuske expressly teaches that these windows may cover more than one side of the bag or may wrap continuously around the bag, so that all or most of the contained articles are visible (col. 7, lines 1-67). Kuske teaches that having a window 96 on the side wall of the bag, in addition to the window 88 on the front wall of the bag, allows the window 96 to serve as a product-remaining indicator or gauge, so that the caregiver can easily determine the number of articles remaining in the bag (Fig. 3, col. 6, lines 49-67). Kuske also teaches that having a window 96 on the side of the bag is useful in situations where the bag is oriented on a retail shelf such that the side wall is visible (col. 6, line 49 to col. 7, line 10). Kuske teaches that substantially all of the bag may be clear if desired, with the exception of any copy material, so that most of the absorbent articles will be visible (col. 7, lines 41-47). Combining a window showing most or all of the articles, as taught by Kuske, with the multiple article types of Lash and the wrappers of Brisebois would produce the claimed invention.